DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 126 027 95 SP 010 222

AUTHOR	Reeves, Carolyn K.
TITLE	Comparisons of Pre- With Post-Self Evaluations and Post-Self With Post-Supervisor's Evaluations Upon Completion of a Competency-Based Institute in Bilingual Education.
INSTITUTION	Mississippi State Univ., State College. Bureau of Educational Research.
SPONS AGENCY	Office of Education (DHEW), Washington, D.C.
PUB DATE	14 Nov 75
GRANT	OEG-0-74-3718
NOTE	30p.; Paper presented at the Annual Mid-South Educational Research Conference (4th, Jackson, Mississippi, November 14, 1975)
EDRS PRICE	MF-$0.83 HC-$2.06 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	American Indians; *Biculturalism; *Bilingual Education; *Choctaw; *Criterion Referenced Tests; Ethnic Groups; Evaluation; *Institutes (Training Programs); *Performance Based Teacher Education; Performance Criteria
IDENTIFIERS	Mississippi

ABSTRACT

A Bilingual-Bicultural Education Institute was conducted on the Choctaw Reservation to identify specific competencies needed by teachers in a bicultural school setting and to explore the use of criterion-referenced measurement in assessing level of performance of the participants. Of the forty people who participated in the Institute, twenty-one were teacher aides whose dominant language is Choctaw, while nineteen were teachers whose dominant language is English. A performance checklist was developed from the objectives specified in the grant proposal to provide bilingual-bicultural education for Choctaw children in Mississippi. An instruction period was then carried out dealing with many facets of bilingual-bicultural teaching and Choctaw language. Pre- and post-self-evaluation and post-supervisor's evaluations were obtained from the performance checklist. The Chi Square statistic was utilized to compare distribution of the pre- and post-self-evaluations and the post-self-evaluations with the post-supervisors' evaluation of the participants. There was a significant difference between the distributions of the pre- and post-self-evaluations. It was concluded from the study that competency based teacher training is needed to equip teachers with skills and competencies needed to work in bilingual-bicultural school settings. Also, the application of criterion referenced measurement to bilingual-bicultural competency based teacher training programs should be further examined. Tables show distributions of pre- and post-evaluations and post-self and supervisor's evaluations of Choctaw and nonChoctaw participants. The performance checklist is also included. (Author/SK)

Documents acquired by ERIC include many informal unpublished materials not available from other sources. ERIC makes every effort to obtain the best copy available. Nevertheless, items of marginal reproducibility are often encountered and this affects the quality of the microfiche and hardcopy reproductions ERIC makes available via the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). EDRS is not responsible for the quality of the original document. Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made from the original.

1779

ED126027

COMPARISONS OF PRE- WITH POST-SELF EVALUATIONS AND POST-SELF WITH POST-SUPERVISOR'S EVALUATIONS UPON COMPLETION OF A COMPETENCY-BASED INSTITUTE IN BILINGUAL EDUCATION*

By

Carolyn K. Reeves
Assistant Professor and Co-Director
Bilingual Education Project
Department of Elementary and Secondary Education
Mississippi State University

Paper Presented at the Fourth Annual
Mid-South Educational Research Conference in
Jackson, Mississippi
November 14, 1975

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

SP010 222

*The research reported herein was performed pursuant to a contract with the United States Office of Education, Grant No. OEO-0-74-3718. It was conducted in cooperation with the Choctaw Tribe and the Bureau of Educational Research, Mississippi State University.

COMPARISONS OF PRE- WITH POST-SELF EVALUATIONS AND POST-SELF WITH POST-SUPERVISOR'S EVALUATIONS UPON COMPLETION OF A COMPETENCY-BASED INSTITUTE IN BILINGUAL EDUCATION

Carolyn K. Reeves
Mississippi State University

ABSTRACT

The study identified some specific competencies needed by teachers teaching in a Choctaw-English bilingual-bicultural school setting and explored the use of criterion-referenced measurement in assessing level of performance of participants involved in a Bilingual-Bicultural Education Institute. Pre- and post-self evaluations and post-supervisor's evaluations were obtained from a Performance Checklist. The Chi Square statistic was utilized to compare distributions of the pre- and post-self evaluations and the post-self evaluations with the post-supervisor's evaluations of the participants. The analyses indicated a significant difference between the distributions of the pre- and post-self evaluations. There were few significant distribution differences between the post-self evaluations and post-supervisor's evaluations of the participants. The study indicated the potential use of criterion-referenced measurement in the area of teacher training for bilingual-bicultural youth.

INTRODUCTION

While competency-based teacher education (CBTE) programs are being implemented in many universities, the competency-based approach has been only superficially explored with respect to preparing teachers for multilingual-multicultural school settings (Hunter, 1974). A major obstacle hindering exploration in this area has been the lack of identification of generic concerns and needs common to all ethnic groups along with lack of identification of specific competencies required for teacher effectiveness in each cultural situation.

Recognizing the need for identification of competencies needed by teachers in multicultural school settings, the American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education (AACTE) established, in 1970, the Multicultural Education/Competency-Based Teacher Education Project (M/CBTE). The Project brought together the findings of various studies, projects, and research efforts in the areas of multicultural education and competency-based teacher education and pointed out that "the capabilities of Performance-Based Teacher Education and multicultural education must be synthesized and realized in a comprehensive program which is applicable both individually and collectively to our multicultural youth . . .(Hunter, 1974, p. 256)." Other published reports have indicated the need for competency-based programs for teachers of multilingual-multicultural children (Grant, 1974; Kalectaca, et al, 1974;

Miller, 1974; Schalock and Hale, 1968; U.S. Commission on Civil Rights, 1974, 1975; and U.S. Department of the Interior, 1973).

Closely related to identification of teacher competencies required for working in specific cultural settings is the problem of measurement and evaluation of training programs attempting to develop multicultural teachers. Because competency-based teacher training involves the determination of individual trainee performance with respect to specified standards or criteria, those methods of measurement and evaluation of programs which examine and compare group differences appear to have little relevance. For example, if the mean group performance of teachers who had participated in a competency-based workshop for teachers of bilingual children was compared with the mean group performance of teachers who had not participated in the workshop and found to be significantly different, it should not be assumed that the specific competencies needed by each teacher had been completely attained. But, explicit information regarding level of attainment of specific competencies could be determined by use of criterion-referenced measurement. Glaser (1963) and other researchers have offered support to the use of measurement which ascertains an individual's status with respect to some criterion, i.e., performance standard, rather than to group-referenced standards (Bloom, 1968; Ebel, 1966; Glaser and Klaus, 1962; Popham and Husek, 1969; and Tucker, 1952). Research examing the application of criterion-referenced measurement and evaluation of multicultural, competency-based teacher training programs is needed.

The purpose of the present study was to identify some specific competencies needed by teachers in a particular bilingual-bicultural school setting and to explore the use of criterion-referenced measurement in assessing level of performance of participants involved in a bilingual-bicultural teacher training institute. The study sought answers to the following questions?

(1) Will there be a significant difference between the distributions of pre- and post-self evaluations on a Performance Checklist of Choctaw participants who attended a Bilingual Education Institute?

(2) Will there be a significant difference between the distributions of pre- and post-self evaluations on a Performance Checklist of NonChoctaw participants who attended a Bilingual Education Institute?

(3) Will there be a significant difference between the distributions of post-self evaluations and post-supervisor evaluations on a Performance Checklist for Choctaw participants who attended a Bilingual Education Institute?

(4) Will there be a significant difference between the distributions of post-self evaluations and post-supervisor evaluations on a Performance Checklist for NonChoctaw participants who attended a Bilingual Education Institute?

Definition of Terms

Certain terms used within the context of the study are defined as follows:

Competency-based teacher education (CBTE) - specifies the competencies to be demonstrated by the student, makes explicit the criteria

to be applied in assessing the student's competencies, and holds the student accountable for meeting those criteria (Cooper & Weber, 1973, p. 14).

Bilingual-bicultural education - is instruction using the native language and culture of the learner as a basis for learning subjects until second language skills have been developed sufficiently (U.S. Commission on Civil Rights, 1975, p. 3).

Criterion-referenced measurement - refers to the use of criterion levels in instruction which can be used to provide information as to the adequacy of an individual's performance (Glaser, 1963, p. 8).

METHODOLOGY

Sample

The sample consisted of 40 people who participated in a Bilingual-Bicultural Education Institute. Twenty-one (21) of the participants were teacher aides whose dominant language is Choctaw, and the remaining nineteen (19) participants were teachers whose dominant language is English. There were 27 females and 13 males. The mean age of the participants was 35 years. Most of the participants were teaching in grades K-3 in the Choctaw Reservation schools in Philadelphia, Mississippi.

Description of Instrument

The Performance Checklist was developed by the director and staff who conducted the Bilingual-Bicultural Education Institute. The items composing the Checklist were formulated from the objectives specified in the grant proposal to provide bilingual-bicultural education for Choctaw children in Mississippi (Bilingual Education for Choctaws of Mississippi (BECOM), 1974).

The Checklist contains 29 items written in the form of tasks to be performed. Following each item is a scale with the following possible responses: could not perform task; could perform task, with help, and could perform task easily.

The Checklist is composed of three parts. Part I contains 13 items that are to be answered only by Choctaws. Part II contains 4 items that are to be answered only by NonChoctaws, and Part III contains 12 items that are to be answered by both Choctaws and NonChoctaws.

Respondents to the Checklist are instructed to read each item and to indicate a level of proficiency for the task described by checking the appropriate response following the item. The Checklist is scored by counting the number of responses checked for each of the three possible categories. (See Appendix A for Performance Checklist)

Reliability and validity information for the Performance Checklist is under investigation. The Checklist appears to possess content validity since this type of validity is dependent upon the correspondence of the test items with the objectives to which the test is referenced. According to Cox (1971), criterion-referenced measures may not yield sufficient variability to make traditional reliability and validity coefficients interpretable; research is needed to examine the use of experimental techniques to establish reliability and validity of criterion-referenced measures.

Method

The Bilingual-Bicultural Education Institute was conducted on the Choctaw Reservation in June and July, 1975, through the Division of Continuing Education at Mississippi State University. The purpose

of the Institue was to equip teachers and teacher aides with some of the skills needed to teach in Choctaw-English bilingual classrooms.

The objectives of the Institute were explained to the participants on the first day of instruction, and the participants were given an opportunity to add objectives. To facilitate attainment of the objectives, instruction during the Institute was conducted in a variety of ways. Each day participants received (a) a small amount of large-group instruction in the theory and rationale for bilingual-bicultural education, (b) two periods of instruction in the Choctaw language, (c) small-group instruction in bilingual-bicultural teaching methodology and materials construction, and (d) individualized instruction in the specific skills that were being developed. For instruction in the Choctaw language, the participants were divided into Choctaw and Non-Choctaw groups. The Choctaw participants received instruction in literacy skills and the NonChoctaw participants received instruction in oral Choctaw.

Choctaw children participated in the Institute and were utilized in mini-teaching situations by the adult participants. The mini-teaching performances were video-taped to provide feedback to the participants and the teaching staff.

Analysis of Data

For each participant three ratings were obtained, pre-, and post-self evaluations and post-supervisor's evaluation. Comparisons were made between the pre- and post-self evaluations on the Performance Checklist and between the post-self evaluations and post-supervisor's evaluations.

The Chi-square statistic was used to analyze the data. Chi-square was computed by utilizing an SPSS (Statistical Package for the Social Sciences) program known as CROSSTABS. The .05 level of significance was utilized for all analyses.

Four separate analyses were made. The first analysis compared the pre- and post-self evaluations of Choctaw participants; the second analysis compared the pre- and post-self evaluations of Non-Choctaw participants; the third analysis compared the post-self evaluations and post-supervisor's evaluations of Choctaw participants; and, the fourth analysis compared the post-self evaluations and post-supervisor's evaluations of NonChoctaw participants.

RESULTS

The distributions of pre- and post-self evaluations of Choctaw participants are shown in Table 1.

Insert Table 1 about here

There was a significant difference between the distributions of the pre- and post-self evaluations of Choctaw participants for all performance items with the exception of two, items 5 and 6.

The distributions of pre- and post-self evaluations of NonChoctaw participants are shown in Table 2.

Insert Table 2 about here

The table indicated that the distribution of responses were significantly different on the pre-self evaluations from those responses on the post-self

evaluations of NonChoctaw participants for all performance items with the exception of item 15.

The distributions of post-self evaluations and post-supervisor's evaluations of Choctaw participants are shown in Table 3.

Insert Table 3 about here

On four performance items, 1, 20, 21, and 27, the distribution of the post-self evaluations of Choctaw participants differed significantly from the distribution of the post-supervisor's evaluations. For all other performance items, there was no significant difference between the post-self evaluations and post-supervisor's evaluations of Choctaw participants.

The distributions of post-self evaluations and post-supervisor's evaluations of NonChoctaw participants are shown in Table 4.

Insert Table 4 about here

On six performance items, 14, 16, 18, 20, 23, and 27, there was a significant difference between the distributions of the post-self evaluations of NonChoctaw participants. For the remaining performance items, there was no significant difference between the distributions.

DISCUSSION

The findings of the study indicated that identification of specific competencies needed by teachers of bilingual-bicultural children prior to training can be of great value to educators involved in bilingual education. Such identification facilitates the evaluation of the effectiveness of bilingual-bicultural teacher training programs, workshops, or institutes.

The study also indicated the potential use of criterion-referenced measurement in the area of teacher training for bilingual-bicultural youth. By establishing different levels of proficiency for the performance items, information can be obtained as to the adequacy of an individual's performance at any point in instruction. Glaser (1963) emphasized the value of establishing levels of proficiency and stated that criterion-referenced measures "indicate the content of the behavioral repertory, and the correspondence between what an individual does and the underlying continuum of achievement (p. 8)." The Performance Checklist utilized in the Bilingual-Bicultural Institute provided a method of determining the level of proficiency attained by each participant on each performance item.

Question One

An examination of Table 1 indicated that the distribution of responses were significantly different on the pre-self evaluations from those on the post-self evaluations for Choctaw participants for all performance items except 5 and 6. Both of these items relate to the task of translating oral Choctaw to oral English and vice versa. It appears that most Choctaw participants had attained an average or higher level of proficiency in the area of oral translation prior to the Institute and, therefore, did not have as great a need for improvement in this area as in the other areas. With regard to the other performance items it appears that good progress was made, as indicated by the low percentages of participants who could not perform tasks after the Institute.

Question Two

The distribution of responses were significantly different on the pre-self evaluations from those on the post-self evaluations for NonChoctaw participants for all performance items except item 15. Item 15 was concerned with the task of understanding oral Choctaw (a lecture or conversation between several Choctaw people). It may be that the difficulty of this task does not permit attainment at a high level of proficiency during a short period of instruction in oral Choctaw. As indicated by the percentages in the categories showing levels of proficiency, most of the NonChoctaw participants moved up one or more levels in their performance during the Institute.

Question Three

Out of the 25 performance items examined, only 4 items reflected a significant difference between the distributions of post-self evaluations and post-supervisor's evaluations of Choctaw participants. For each of these 4 items, 1, 20, 21, and 27, the distribution of post-supervisor's evaluations showed larger percentages of Choctaws who could perform tasks easily than did the distribution of post-self evaluations of Choctaws. It seems that the supervisors perceived that the Choctaws had attained a higher level of proficiency on these 4 items than did the Choctaw participants. Two possible explanations are offered for this discrepancy. First, it may be that the teaching staff observed several aspects of teaching behavior that, taken together, indicated the participant could perform at a higher level of proficiency than could be perceived by the participant.

Secondly, the Choctaw participants may have lacked self-confidence in their performance because many of them had not been involved in teaching experiences which utilized their native language prior to the Institute.

With regard to the remaining performance items, the distribution of responses of the post-self evaluations seemed to be congruent with the distribution of responses of post-supervisor's evaluations of Choctaw participants. For items 10 and 11 the distributions of responses were identical.

Question Four

An examination of Table 4 indicated that for 6 items, 14, 16, 18, 20, 23, and 27, the distributions of the post-self evaluations differed significantly from the distributions of the post-supervisor's evaluations of NonChoctaw participants. For these six items, the post-supervisor's evaluations showed larger percentages falling in the could perform task easily category than did the post-self evaluations of NonChoctaw participants. A partial explanation for this discrepancy between the post-supervisor's evaluations and the post-self evaluations of NonChoctaw participants could be that the teaching staff did not have an opportunity to see the participants perform in a wide variety of situations in the Choctaw schools and community. This discrepancy in perception of performance also indicates that self-perception of performance may offer a unique contribution to competency-based teacher training and, perhaps, should be used in conjunction with other measures of performance.

For the other items examined, there was not significant differences between the distributions of post-self evaluations and post-supervisor

evaluations of NonChoctaw participants. While the distributions were not significantly different, it was interesting to note that for items 26 and 28 the post-supervisor's evaluations reflected that 6.3 percent of NonChoctaws could not perform the tasks while the post-self evaluations reflected 0.0 percent in this category.

CONCLUSIONS

One of the conclusions drawn from the study was that competency-based teacher training is needed to equip teachers with skills and competencies needed to work in bilingual-bicultural school settings. It was shown that competencies unique to specific cultural situations can be identified and that levels of proficiency can be established to provide a method of assessing individual teacher trainee's progress. Further research is needed to identify clusters of competencies which cover major skill areas so that educators involved in bilingual-bicultural teacher preparation will be able to develop within trainees a wide range of behaviors leading to the acquisition of specific skills needed to teach bilingual-bicultural children.

Another conclusion drawn from the study was that the application of criterion-referenced measurement to bilingual-bicultural, competency-based teacher training programs should be examined further. The study indicated that criterion-referenced measurement is particularly applicable to programs attempting to develop teachers competent in two languages. Further research is needed to determine appropriate techniques for establishing reliability and validity of criterion-referenced measures for use in bilingual-bicultural teacher training programs.

References

Bilingual Education for Choctaws of Mississippi (BECOM). Grant proposal prepared by Choctaw Board of Education and Choctaw Agency of Bureau of Indian Affairs. Philadelphia, Mississippi, 1974.

Bloom, Benjamin S. Learning for mastery Evaluation Comment, Center for the Study of Education, 1968, 1. No.2.

Cooper, James M. and W. A. Weber. A competency based systems approach to teacher education. In M. V. DeVault, D. W. Anderson, and G. E. Dickson, Compency Based Teacher Education. Berkeley, California: McCutchan Publishing Corporation, 1973.

Cox, Richard C. Evaluative aspects of criterion-referenced measures. In W. J. Popham, Criterion-Referenced Measurement, Englewood Cliffs, N. J.: Education Technology Publications, 1971.

Ebel, Robert L. Some measurement problems in a national assessment of educational progress. Journal of Educational Measurement, 1966, 3. 11-17.

Glaser, Robert. Instructional technology and the measurement of learning outcomes. American Psychologist, 1963, 18, 519-521.

Glaser, R. and D. J. Klaus. Proficiency measurement: Assessing human performance. In R. Gagne, Psychological Principles in System Development. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1962.

Grunt, Carl. Inplications for the Recruitment and Training of Minority Educators. PBTE7. Newsletter of the Multi-State Consortium on Performance-Based Teacher Education. Syracuse, New York, 1974.

Hunter, William A. (ed.). Multicultural Education Through Competency-Based Teacher Education. Washington, D. C.: American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education, 1974.

Kalectaca, M. G. Knowles, and R. Butterfield. To help--not to homogenize Native American children. Educational Leadership, 1974, 31, 590-592.

Miller, Louise. A need for competency-based teacher education for Native Americans. In William Hunter (ed.), Multicultural Education Through Competency-Based Teacher Education. Washington, D. C.: American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education, 1974.

Popham, W. James and T. R. Husek. Implications of criterion-referenced measurement. Journal of Educational Measurement, 1969, 6, 1-9.

Schalock, H. D. and J. R. Hale (eds.). A Competency-Based, Field Centered, Systems Approach to Elementary Teacher Education. Final Report for Project No. 89022. Washington, D. C.: Bureau of Research, U. S. Office of Education, 1968.

Tucker, L. Scales minimizing the importance of referenced groups. In Proceedings, Invitational Conference on Testing Problems. Princeton, N. J.: Educational Testing Service, 1952, 22-28.

U. S. Commission on Civil Rights. Toward Quality Education for Mexican Americans. Report VI: Mexican-American Education Study. Washington, D. C.: Government Printing Office, 1974.

U. S. Commission on Civil Rights. A Better Chance to Learn: Bilingual-Bicultural Education. Washington, D. C.: Clearinghouse Publication, 1975.

U. S. Department of the Interior. Statistics Concerning Indian Education, Fiscal Year 1973. Washington, D. C.: Bureau of Indian Affiars, Office of Indian Education Programs, 1973.

TABLE 1

Distribution of Pre- and Post-Self Evaluations of Choctaw Participants

Item	Distribution by Percent: could not perform task	could perform task, with help	could perform task easily	df	χ^2
1. Teach a lesson using the Choctaw language throughout the lesson	47.6[a]	42.9	9.5	2	14.883***
	0.0[b]	57.1	42.9		
2. Compose and write short personal notes in Choctaw to friends	57.1	38.1	4.8		
	0.0	66.7	33.3	2	18.136***
3. Translate written Choctaw to written English	42.9	47.6	9.5		
	0.0	57.1	42.9	2	13.636***
4. Translate written English to written Choctaw	52.4	38.1	9.5		
	0.0	66.7	33.3	2	15.414***
5. Translate oral Choctaw to oral English	14.3	33.3	52.4		
	0.0	23.8	76.2	2	4.259
6. Translate oral English to oral Choctaw	19.0	28.6	52.4		
	0.0	23.8	76.2	2	5.016
7. Read Choctaw aloud for an audience	57.1	38.1	4.8		
	4.8	76.2	19.0	2	13.774***
8. Prepare lists and notes in Choctaw for personal use (for example, shopping list, etc.)	66.7	23.8	9.5		
	0.0	66.7	33.3	2	21.040***
9. Transcribe Choctaw stories, anecdotes, etc., from tape and fro[illegible]tation	71.4	23.8	4.8		
	0.0	81.0	19.0	2	23.345***
10. Write a report or essay [illegible] Choctaw	71.4	23.8	4.8		
	9.5	81.0	9.5	2	16.819***

(Table 1 continued)

Item	Distribution by Percent: could not perform task	could perform task, with help	could perform task easily	df	χ^2
11. Take notes on meetings and addresses given in Choctaw	76.2	9.5	14.3		
	14.3	61.9	23.8	2	17.461***
12. Prepare notes in Choctaw for an oral speech	76.2	19.0	4.8		
	9.5	61.9	28.6	2	19.225***
13. Write lesson plans in Choctaw	81.0	9.5	9.5		
	4.8	66.7	28.6	2	25.222***
18. Read Choctaw, with understanding (simple sentences)	33.3	47.6	19.0		
	0.0	28.6	71.4	2	14.368***
19. Read Choctaw, with understanding (several paragraphs)	38.1	42.9	19.0		
	0.0	47.6	52.4	2	11.319**
20. Construct materials for use in developing Choctaw vocabulary in the classroom setting	61.9	28.6	9.5		
	0.0	61.9	38.1	2	19.178***
21. Supervise pupils' tasks which include work with Choctaw words and sentences	52.4	38.1	9.5		
	0.0	66.7	33.3	2	15.414***
22. Prepare a 15 minute talk defending bilingual education (this would include information about rationale, legislation, etc. - you could prepare it in Choctaw or in English)	76.2	23.8	0.0		
	9.5	66.7	23.8	2	20.152***
23. Locate resource material/people to be used in a Choctaw bilingual classroom	52.4	33.3	14.3		
	4.8	52.4	42.9	2	12.222**
24. Locate materials or information about bilingual education and evaluate it critically	66.7	23.8	9.5		
	9.5	61.9	28.6	2	14.555***
25. Prepare a 15 minute talk defending the use of structured ESL lessons (you could prepare it in Choctaw or in English	76.2	19.0	4.8		
	23.8	57.1	19.0	2	11.561**

(Table 1 continued)

Item	Distribution by Percent: could not perform task	could perform task, with help	could perform task easily	df	χ^2
26. Show or tell another person something about Choctaw grammar	71.4	14.3	14.3		
	0.0	57.1	42.9	2	23.400***
27. Decide which of the reading skills can be applied in the classroom when teaching children to read Choctaw	66.7	23.8	9.5		
	0.0	76.2	23.8	2	21.047***
28. Point out some grammatical differences between English and Choctaw	71.4	9.5	19.0		
	0.0	66.7	33.3	2	24.818***
29. Prepare posters, signs, and bulletin board in Choctaw	76.2	9.5	14.3		
	0.0	52.4	47.6	2	26.000***

*** Significant at .001 level
** Significant at .01 level
* Significant at .05 level
[a]Pre-self percentages
[b]Post-self percentages

TABLE 2

Distribution of Pre- and Post-Self Evaluations of NonChoctaw Participants

Item	Distribution by Percent: could not perform task	could perform task, with help	could perform task easily	df	χ^2
14. Understand spoken Choctaw (simple sentences)	56.3[a]	43.8	0.0		
	6.3[b]	81.3	12.5	2	10.200**
15. Understand spoken Choctaw (lecture or conversation between several people)	68.8	31.3	0.0		
	43.8	50.0	6.3	2	2.581
16. Speak Choctaw well enough to be understood by a Choctaw speaker (simple sentences)	62.5	37.5	0.0		
	6.3	81.3	12.5	2	11.942**
17. Teach a structured ESL lesson	43.8	6.3	50.0		
	0.0	31.3	68.8	2	10.140**
18. Read Choctaw, with understanding (simple sentences)	87.5	12.5	0.0		
	6.3	81.3	12.5	2	21.333***
19. Read Choctaw, with understanding (several paragraphs)	93.8	6.3	0.0		
	56.3	43.8	0.0	1	4.166*
20. Construct materials for use in developing Choctaw vocabulary in the classroom setting	87.5	12.5	0.0		
	0.0	75.0	25.0	2	25.142***
21. Supervise pupils' tasks which include work with Choctaw words and sentences	93.8	6.3	0.0		
	6.3	68.8	25.0	2	24.583***

(Table 2 continued)

Item	Distribution by Percent: could not perform task	could perform task, with help	could perform task easily	df	χ^2
22. Prepare a 15 minute talk defending bilingual education (this would include information about rationale, legislation, etc. - you could prepare it in Choctaw or in English)	50.0	31.3	18.8		
	6.3	37.5	56.3	2	8.535**
23. Locate resource material/people to be used in a Choctaw bilingual classroom	18.8	62.5	18.8		
	0.0	43.8	56.3	2	6.529*
24. Locate material or information about bilingual education and evaluate it critically	43.8	56.3	0.0		
	0.0	37.5	62.5	2	17.600***
25. Prepare a 15 minute talk defending the use of structured ESL lessons (you could prepare it in Choctaw or in English)	43.8	31.3	25.0		
	6.3	43.8	50.0	2	6.166*
26. Show or tell another person something about Choctaw grammar	93.8	6.3	0.0		
	0.0	62.5	37.5	2	28.363***
27. Decide which of the reading skills can be applied in the classroom when teaching children to read Choctaw	87.5	12.5	0.0		
	0.0	87.5	12.5	2	25.000***
28. Point out some grammatical differences between English and Choctaw	56.3	43.8	0.0		
	0.0	62.5	37.5	2	15.529***
29. Prepare posters, signs, and bulletin board in Choctaw	68.8	25.0	6.3		
	0.0	68.8	31.3	2	16.933***

*** Significant at .001 level
** Significant at .01 level
* Significant at .05 level
[a]Pre-self Percentages
[b]Post-self Percentages

TABLE 3

Distribution of Post-Self Evaluations and Post-Supervisor's Evaluations of Choctaw Participants

Item	Distribution by Percent: could not perform task	could perform task, with help	could perform task easily	df	χ^2
1. Teach a lesson using the Choctaw language throughout the lesson	0.0[a]	57.14	42.9		
	0.0[b]	14.3	85.7	1	6.637**
2. Compose and write short personal notes in Choctaw to friends	0.0	66.7	33.3		
	0.0	33.3	66.7	1	3.428
3. Translate written Choctaw to written English	0.0	57.1	42.9		
	4.8	42.9	52.4	2	1.628
4. Translate written English to written Choctaw	0.0	66.7	33.3		
	4.8	61.9	33.3	2	1.037
5. Translate oral Choctaw to oral English	0.0	23.8	76.2		
	0.0	4.8	95.2	1	1.750
6. Translate oral English to oral Choctaw	0.0	23.8	76.2		
	0.0	9.5	90.5	1	0.685
7. Read Choctaw aloud for an audience	4.8	76.2	19.0		
	9.5	52.4	38.1	2	2.592
8. Prepare lists and notes in Choctaw for personal use (for example, shopping lists, etc.)	0.0	66.7	33.3		
	0.0	38.1	61.9	1	2.386
9. Transcribe Choctaw stories, anecdotes, etc., from tape and from dictation	0.0	81.0	19.0		
	4.8	47.6	47.6	2	5.386
10. Write a report or essay in Choctaw	9.5	81.0	9.5		
	9.5	81.0	9.5	2	.0000

(Table 3 continued)

Item	Distribution by Percent: could not perform task	could perform task, with help	could perform task easily	df	χ^2
11. Take notes on meetings and addresses given in Choctaw	14.3	61.9	23.8		
	14.3	61.9	23.8	2	.0000
12. Prepare notes in Choctaw for an oral speech	9.5	61.9	28.6		
	0.0	52.4	47.6	2	3.166
13. Write lesson plans in Choctaw	4.8	66.7	28.6		
	4.8	61.9	33.3	2	.1139
18. Read Choctaw, with understanding (simple sentences)	0.0	28.6	71.4		
	0.0	23.8	76.2	1	.0000
19. Read Choctaw, with understanding (several paragraphs)	0.0	47.6	52.4		
	0.0	28.6	71.4	1	.9086
20. Construct materials for use in developing Choctaw vocabulary in the classroom setting	0.0	61.9	38.1		
	0.0	23.8	76.2	1	4.763*
21. Supervise pupils' tasks which include work with Choctaw words and sentences	0.0	66.7	33.3		
	0.0	23.8	76.2	1	6.151**
22. Prepare a 15 minute talk defending bilingual education (this would include information about rationale, legislation, etc. - you could prepare it in Choctaw or in English)	9.5	66.7	23.8		
	9.5	61.9	28.6	2	.1279
23. Locate resource material/people to be used in a Choctaw bilingual classroom	4.8	52.4	42.9		
	0.0	28.6	71.4	2	3.970
24. Locate material or information about bilingual education and evaluate it critically	9.5	61.9	28.6		
	0.0	61.9	38.1	2	2.285
25. Prepare a 15 minute talk defending the use of structured ESL lessons (you could prepare it in Choctaw or in English)	23.8	57.1	19.0		
	19.0	71.4	9.5	2	1.111

(Table 3 continued)

Item	Distribution by Percent: could not perform task	could perform task, with help	could perform task easily	df	χ^2
26. Show or tell another person something about Choctaw grammar	0.0	57.1	42.9		
	0.0	38.1	61.9	1	.8590
27. Decide which of the reading skills can be applied in the classroom when teaching children to read Choctaw	0.0	76.2	23.8		
	0.0	42.9	57.1	1	3.557*
28. Point out some grammatical differences between English and Choctaw	0.0	66.7	33.3		
	4.8	47.6	47.6	2	2.196
29. Prepare posters, signs, and bulletin board in Choctaw	0.0	52.4	47.6		
	0.0	23.8	76.2	1	2.524

*** Significant at .001 level
** Significant at .01 level
* Significant at .05 level
[a]Post-self Percentages
[b]Post-supervisor's Percentages

TABLE 4

Distribution of Post-Self Evaluations and Post-Supervisor's Evaluations of NonChoctaw Participants

Item	Distribution by Percent: could not perform task	could perform task, with help	could perform task easily	df	χ^2
14. Understand spoken Choctaw (simple sentences)	6.3[a]	81.3	12.5		
	12.5[b]	25.0	62.5	2	10.431**
15. Understand spoken Choctaw (lecture or conversation between several people)	43.8	50.0	6.3		
	25.0	62.5	12.5	2	1.373
16. Speak Choctaw well enough to be understood by a Choctaw speaker (simple sentences)	6.3	81.3	12.5		
	12.5	25.0	62.5	2	10.431**
17. Teach a structured ESL lesson	0.0	31.3	68.8		
	0.0	18.8	81.3	1	.1666
18. Read Choctaw, with understanding (simple sentences)	6.3	81.3	12.5		
	37.5	0.0	62.5	2	21.904***
19. Read Choctaw, with understanding (several paragraphs)	56.3	43.8	0.0		
	37.5	50.0	12.5	2	2.666
20. Construct materials for use in developing Choctaw vocabulary in the classroom setting	0.0	75.0	25.0		
	6.3	25.0	68.8	2	8.266**
21. Supervise pupils' tasks which include work with Choctaw words and sentences	6.3	68.8	25.0		
	0.0	37.5	62.5	2	5.042

(Table 4 continued)

Item	Distribution by Percent: could not perform task	could perform task, with help	could perform task easily	df	χ^2
22. Prepare a 15 minute talk defending bilingual education (this would include information about rationale, legislation, etc. - you could prepare it in Choctaw or in English	6.3	37.5	56.3		
	6.3	18.8	75.0	2	1.428
23. Locate resource material/people to be used in a Choctaw bilingual classroom	0.0	43.8	56.3		
	0.0	6.3	93.8	1	4.166*
24. Locate material or information about bilingual education and evaluate it critically	0.0	37.5	62.5		
	0.0	6.3	93.8	1	2.925
25. Prepare a 14 minute talk defending the use of structured ESL lessons (you could prepare it in Choctaw or in English)	6.3	43.8	50.0		
	6.3	18.8	75.0	2	2.400
26. Show or tell another person something about Choctaw grammar	0.0	62.5	37.5		
	6.3	25.0	68.8	2	5.042
27. Decide which of the reading skills can be applied in the classroom when teaching children to read Choctaw	0.0	87.5	12.5		
	0.0	18.8	81.3	1	12.549***
28. Point out some grammatical differences between English and Choctaw	0.0	62.5	37.5		
	6.3	25.0	68.8	2	5.042
29. Prepare posters, signs, and bulletin boards in Choctaw	0.0	68.8	31.3		
	0.0	81.3	18.8	1	.1666

*** Significant at .001 level
** Significant at .01 level
* Significant at .05 level
[a]Post-self Percentages
[b]Post-supervisor's Percentages

APPENDIX A

NAME OF PARTICIPANT _____

PERFORMANCE CHECKLIST

Task	could not perform task	could perform task, with help	could perform task easily
I. TO BE ANSWERED ONLY BY CHOCTAWS			
1. Teach a lesson using the Choctaw language throughout the lesson			
2. Compose and write short personal notes in Choctaw to friends			
3. Translate written Choctaw to written English			
4. Translate written English to written Choctaw			
5. Translate written Choctaw to written English			
6. Translate oral English to oral Choctaw			
7. Read Choctaw aloud for an audience			
8. Prepare lists and notes in Choctaw for personal use (for example, shopping list, etc.)			
9. Transcribe Choctaw stories, anecdotes, etc. from tape and from dictation			
10. Write a report or essay in Choctaw			
11. Take notes on meetings and addresses given in Choctaw			
12. Prepare notes in Choctaw for an oral speech			
13. Write lesson plans in Choctaw			
II. TO BE ANSWERED ONLY BY NONCHOCTAWS			
14. Understand spoken Choctaw (simple sentences)			
15. Understand spoken Choctaw (lecture or conversation between several people)			

	could not perform task	could perform task, with help	could perform task easily
16. Speak Choctaw well enough to be understood by a Choctaw speaker (simple sentences)	_____	_____	_____
17. Teach a structured ESL lesson	_____	_____	_____
III. TO BE ANSWERED BY <u>BOTH</u> CHOCTAWS AND NONCHOCTAWS			
18. Read Choctaw, with understanding (simple sentences)	_____	_____	_____
19. Read Choctaw, with understanding (several paragraphs)	_____	_____	_____
20. Construct materials for use in developing Choctaw vocabulary in the classroom setting	_____	_____	_____
21. Supervise pupils' tasks which include work with Choctaw words and sentences	_____	_____	_____
22. Prepare a 15 minute talk defending bilingual education (this would include information about rationale, legislation, etc.--you could prepare it in Choctaw or in English)	_____	_____	_____
23. Locate resource material/people to be used in a Choctaw bilingual classroom	_____	_____	_____
24. Locate material or information about bilingual education and evaluate it critically	_____	_____	_____
25. Prepare a 15 minute talk defending the use of structured ESL lessons (you could prepare it in Choctaw or in English)	_____	_____	_____
26. Show or tell another person something about Choctaw grammar	_____	_____	_____
27. Decide which of the reading skills can be applied in the classroom when teaching children to read Choctaw	_____	_____	_____
28. Point out some grammatical differences between English and Choctaw	_____	_____	_____
29. Prepare posters, signs, and bulletin board in Choctaw	_____	_____	_____